

that the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness over amended claim 9.

Claims 10-11, 27 and 33 depend from claim 9, and recite their own features in addition to the features of claim 9. Applicant submits that claims 10-11, 27 and 33 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 9. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shimatani and Wright, in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,368,150 to Worchester. The Examiner relies on Worchester for disclosing a shield casing for transformers. The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement openings in the shield case of Shimatani to enable interconnections between the components inside the shield case and the other components on the circuit board.

Applicant submits that Worchester neither discloses nor suggests those features of claim 34, which depends from claim 9, demonstrated above to be missing of Shimatani and Wright. Therefore, Applicant submits that the combination of Shimatani, Wright and Worchester does not disclose nor suggest the invention of claim 34 for at least the same reasons.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Final Office Action dated November 4, 2005 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 9-11, 27 and 33-34 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully

